

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant requests reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the arguments below that point out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims patentable.

Specification Amendments

In response to paragraph 1 of the Office Action, applicant has added headings to the specification. None of these headings involves new matter. Paragraph numbers have also been added.

Claim Amendments

In response to paragraphs 2-12 of the Office Action, applicant has made amendments to the claims, as is discussed in detail below. As a result of these amendments, claims 1 and 3-9 are pending.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

In the above-identified Office Action, claims 2-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for having no antecedent basis for "the catch" (claim 2) and "said shield element" (claim 4). Applicant has moved the subject matter of claim 2 into claims one and canceled claim 2 without prejudice. In adding the subject matter of claim 2 to claim 1, applicant amended the "catch arrangement" to now read the --latch mechanism--. Applicant submits that the rejection has been overcome since a "latch mechanism" is recited at the beginning of the same paragraph.

Applicant has made claim 4 dependent from claim 3, which is in turn dependent from claim 1. Claim 1 has incorporated the subject matter of claim 2 which recited a "shield element." Such shield element now exists in the "wherein" paragraph of claim 1. Claim 3 has been amended to recite a "shield element" thereby providing full antecedent basis for "said shield element" recited in claim 4.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

In the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kelley et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,679,154). Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the

subject matter of claim 2, which was indicated as allowable by the Office in paragraph 13 of the Office Action. Applicant therefore submits that the rejection of claim 1 has been overcome.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelley et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,679,154) and Lindlof (U.S. Patent No. 3,676,387). Applicant has amended independent claim 7 to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2. Applicant submits that therefore the rejection of claims 7 and 8 has been overcome since claim 2 was indicated as allowable in paragraph 13 of the Office Action.

CONCLUSION

By means of the above amendments and the Remarks/Arguments above, Applicant has attempted to overcome all rejections of the application and place it form for allowance. No new matter has been included in any amendment. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and credit any overpayment relating to this paper to Deposit Account No. 06-2425.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LLP

Dated: May 6, 2009

By: /thomas a. runk/
Thomas A. Runk
Registration No. 30,679

TAR:njw

Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone: (310) 824-5555
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201